

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/017,193 | 12/12/2001 | Mai Huong Dang | 52200.8010 | 5901 |
| 22918 | 7590 11/08/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| PERKINS COIE LLP P.O. BOX 2168 | | | PADGETT, MARIANNE L | |
| | RK, CA 94026 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | • | | 1762 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | اه | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|------------|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 10/017,193 | DANG ET AL. | 47 | | | |
| , | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Marianne L. Padgett | 1762 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | lress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of | | | | | | |
| b) LJ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>15 October 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | | |
| (b) _ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | pelow); | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) \square they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment (explanation of how the new or amended claims wo | s) a) \boxtimes will not be entered or b) uld be rejected is provided belo | ☐ will be entered a w or appended. | and an | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15,20-26 and 29-31</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 11,16-19,27-28,32 | | | | | | |
| 8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| | Mariann Horsett | MARIANNE PADGI PRIMARY EXAMIN | ETT NER | | | |

Continuation of 2. NOTE: 1)the requirement of atmospheric plasma in a chamber as opposed to open atmosphere is a new issue; 2) exposing the surface (no longer necessarily the treated/exposed surface, so no positively claimed conversion of active species, only implied) to liquid or gas without plasma is a new issue; 3) as the treating step (a), has been changed to an exposing step, it is no longer clear when the optional contacting step is preformed, also a new issue.

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the art rejections based on Beumer et al lacks an exposure step in the absence of plasma, hence would be overcome.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The new issues need further consideration & possible search, also while Ikada et al do not teach necessary use of a chamber when performing atmospheric pressure corona discharge, neither do they exclude use of a chamber, which would provide protection from contamination, etc, hence there are motivatin reasons to employ such depending on conditions at the production site, etc., so this new issue would need revised rejections.